

## **REMARKS**

This Response A is made to the first office action, which is dated March 30, 2005. This application was filed with 17 claims of which claim 2 is now cancelled and claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 8-17 are now amended. Thus, 16 of the original 17 claims remain in this application.

Applicant notes with appreciation that the Examiner indicates the allowability of claims 3-6 and 10-15. The Examiner notes the primary reason for allowance of claim 3 is the inclusion of a releasable lock, while claim 6 includes an L-shaped enclosure, and claim 10 includes an axial securing means. Thus, each of claims 3 and 6 are amended to be in independent form, including the limitations of each of the claims from which they depend, respectively.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. The Examiner gives specific comments with regard to claims 1 and continues the comments regarding claims 2-4, 6-10, 13, and 16.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 13, and 16 are, however, amended in consideration of the Examiner's comments. Further, in consideration of the totality of the amendments in this Response, claim 2 is cancelled to avoid duplicity.

More specifically, the independent claims 1, 16, and 17 are amended to add the limitation of the releasable lock of claim 3. Thus, this rejection is overcome. Independent claim 1 and its dependant claims 7-9 and independent claims 16 and 17 are submitted as being allowable for at least the same reason that claim 3 is noted as being allowable by the Examiner.

Claims 1, 2, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Strohmeyer '184. Also, claims 16 and 17 are rejected under §102(b) as being anticipated by

Aarons '061. These rejections are respectfully traversed. In consideration of the amendments discussed above, however, these rejections are submitted as being overcome.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Strohmeyer '184 and the Jacobson '105 patents. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Again, however, in consideration of the amendments discussed above, this rejection is submitted as being overcome.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Peters

Dated: 8/1/05

By 

John A. Waters, Reg. No. 24,802  
VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT  
Bridgewater Place  
333 Bridge Street  
Post Office Box 352  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501-0352  
(616) 336-6000